

11200

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

livelihood, but a diversified manufacturing center under progressive and capable leadership. It suffered intensely during the depression of the 1930's and has fought back to reestablish itself, and today it is one of the nerve centers of New England.

The city of Manchester is not alone, of course, in the concern it expresses. In recent weeks I have received a great many letters from individuals in all walks of life expressing the hope that the Senate will take steps to make the act more responsive to the needs of our domestic industries. The type of relief that is needed should be available when injury is detected, and not, as is the case with our New England textile industry, for example, after 205 plants have been closed and 140,000 jobs lost since 1949.

Mr. President, as do all other thinking people, I recognize the need for expanding our foreign markets and engaging in mutually profitable trade with other countries; but this must be accomplished in such a way that American firms are not forced out of business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CITY OF MANCHESTER, N. H.,  
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,  
June 20, 1958.

The Honorable H. BYRLES BRIDGES,  
United States Senator, Senate Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen held June 3, 1958, a lengthy discussion was entered into relative to the proposed reciprocal trade bill now pending before Congress and United States Senate, which has the endorsement of the President Eisenhower Administration.

At the conclusion of the debate on this question, it was unanimously voted that this board go on record as strenuously opposed to this proposed legislation, and that the New Hampshire delegation in both the House of Representatives and the United States Senate, be advised of this action.

Respectfully yours,

M. J. QUINN, City Clerk.

## QUALITY EDUCATION

MR. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in recent days and weeks, while we have been hearing much aboutatchood and Lebanon, two great speeches have been made which did not attract sufficient attention.

The first was that of Allen Dulles before the United States Chamber of Commerce last April 28.

The second, more recent, was that of Palmer Hoyt, publisher of the Denver Post before the National Citizens Council for Better Schools at Timberline Lodge, Mount Hood, Oreg., on June 19. It is entitled "Quality Education."

Seldom have I read a more thought-provoking address. I would hope that Mr. Hoyt would agree to one change: that he propose a National Academy of Learning instead of merely a National Science Academy.

Mr. President, most of what we talk about in committees of the Senate and

on the Senate floor, has to do with the "short pull." From the standpoint of the "long pull," and what is necessary for the security of our country, I hope that every Senator will take the time to read Mr. Hoyt's outstanding speech.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address by Palmer Hoyt printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

## QUALITY EDUCATION

"The shadow of the Russian satellite is surprisingly large and persistent for so small an object." This observation was made by Dr. Henry Smythe before the American Nuclear Society last October.

That shadow shocked the American public as nothing has ever shocked it before.

For the first time since America has been the world's No. 1 nation, our supremacy was threatened. Sputnik was particularly a shock too, because our leaders had not advised us of the international facts of life. Mostly they had not advised us what the Russians were up to because they didn't know themselves.

October 4, 1957, will forever rank as one of the great days in our history. It was a Rip Van Winkle day. It was the day we woke up.

Shaking us was the appearance of Sputnik I. It was probably the best thing that ever happened to us.

The American dream of absolute superiority in all things technical, mechanical, and scientific, was rudely shattered.

Conversely, the launching of sputnik was not so good from the purely Russian standpoint. Someone said recently, and I agree, that history will record that Sputnik I will go down as Khrushchev's No. 1 mistake.

Without sputnik, no one would have believed the real story of Russia's scientific progress.

When sputnik appeared in our skies, it was to most of the world, including many Americans, a sign that the United States of America was no longer the world's No. 1 nation.

Naturally when an event of such cataclysmic importance occurs, the second guessers have a field day.

Who, they asked, was to blame?

The Government?

The President?

The Pentagon?

Rivalry between the services, or education?

The answer was almost unanimous—it was education.

Once education was established as the goat, the great debate began between the "education for life" or "progressive education" boys and the advocates of the three R's or "basic education."

The "three R's" boys, probably a majority among laymen, blamed it all on Dewey, even persons who weren't clear on whether it was Adm. George Dewey, politician Tom Dewey, or educator John Dewey. Anyway, they figured somebody "dood it," so it must have been Dewey.

To say criticism was rife would be a masterpiece of understatement.

The little red schoolhouse again became the symbol of learning. Complaints were made about the slowness of modern education.

Criticisms were heard like this:

"When we were boys, boys had to do a little work in school. They were not coaxed; they were hammered. Spelling, writing, and arithmetic were not electives, and you had to learn.

"In these more fortunate times, elementary education has become in many places a sort of vaudeville show. The child must be kept amused and learns what he pleases. Many teachers scorn the old-fashioned rudiments, and it seems to be regarded as a misfortune and a crime for a child to learn to read and spell by the old methods. As a result of all the improvements, there is a race of gifted pupils more or less ignorant of the once-prized elements of an ordinary education."

This statement sounds as though it were made yesterday by one of our very modern critics. It is actually a quotation from the New York Sun, printed on October 5, 1902, and reprinted in Harper's magazine for May of this year.

Thus, to continue the argument as to whether we should "educate for life" or get back to the little red schoolhouse is as silly as to presuppose that the only science the Russians are interested in is rocketry. Actually the Russians are interested in everything, in everything, scientific or otherwise, and the quicker we get that through our "nudzicks," the better off we are going to be. If we don't, we're apt to be off this pleasant sphere we call earth more or less permanently.

However, before we leave the Dewey boys completely, I want to tell you, particularly you fellow laymen, that it was John Dewey, all right, who got us into trouble.

Strangely enough, he got us into trouble because we didn't follow the basic tenets of his great wisdom.

So I want to go right back to John Dewey for guidance in our state of clear and present danger.

I am indebted to Dr. Samuel B. Gould, president of Antioch College, for clarification of John Dewey's aims.

Dr. Gould suggested in a recent speech that John Dewey's plea for linking education to usefulness in society was anything but an attack on intellectualism. Dr. Gould points out, and I think with great insight, that John Dewey never advocated the kind of superficial and ridiculous courses and methods developed by some of his so-called followers.

I would like to call your attention to this quote from Dr. John Dewey:

"Education, if it is really education, should send (youth) forth with some unified sense of the kind of world in which they live; the directions in which it is moving, and the part they have to play in it. The schools should have given them some sort of intellectual and moral key to their contemporary world. . . . As for methods, the same need of every person at present is capacity to think; the power to see problems, to relate facts to them."

This quotation from John Dewey could well be made our guiding light in this, our fight for survival.

What better can we do than send youth forth with "some unified sense of the kind of world in which they live, the direction in which it is moving, and the part they have to play in it?"

Citizens who have that kind of sense won't tolerate a government that talks loosely, as witness some early remarks about sputnik.

"We aren't engaging in any celestial basketball games."

"So the Russians threw a hunk of iron into the sky. What's so great about that?"

No properly informed citizens tolerate a government that permits its three armed services to engage in costly rivalry and allows each in its own way to pursue plans to shoot the moon.

Nor would citizens with the wisdom John Dewey refers to be happy with a government that shows no sense of urgency in the light of the 2,900-pound Sputnik No. 3 that roams our skies as we talk here tonight.